

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-31 were pending and stand rejected. None of the claims has been amended.

Claims 1-3, 7-12, 16-17, 20-25, and 28-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chandrasekaran in view of Hamada. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 recites:

A method of handling messages received at a messaging system server, the method comprising:

storing, in non-persistent storage, messages received from at least one client;

removing delivered messages from the non-persistent storage; and saving to persistent storage, after a delay interval has elapsed, at least one of the messages stored in the non-persistent storage, so that a message saved to persistent storage can be retrieved and delivered.

Neither Chandrasekaran nor Hamada, alone or combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests the claimed element “removing delivered messages from the non-persistent storage.”

Chandrasekaran discusses a system for propagating (transmitting) a message from a source site 200 to a destination site 202 (abstract). The source site tracks messages using a propagation queue 204 and a propagation table 212 (7:61-63; FIG. 2A). The propagation queue, which is in volatile memory, stores information about a message that is awaiting transmission (7:63-65). The propagation table, which is in non-volatile memory, stores a history of the messages that have been transmitted (8:66-9:2).

In Chandrasekaran, a message saved in the propagation queue is transmitted as follows: First, the message is “dequeued” (removed) from the propagation queue (7:17-19). Next, the message is assigned a propagation sequence number (7:19-21). Finally, the message is transmitted (7:28-30). Assume, *arguendo*, that the propagation queue in Chandrasekaran corresponds to the “non-persistent storage” of claim 1. Chandrasekaran does not disclose removing delivered messages from the propagation queue. Since messages are removed from the

propagation queue before they are transmitted, the propagation queue cannot contain any messages that have been transmitted, let alone messages that have been delivered. Thus, Chandrasekaran does not disclose, teach, or suggest “removing delivered messages from the non-persistent storage.”

Hamada does not remedy this deficiency. Hamada discusses a message communication and distribution system (abstract). FIG. 21, cited by the Examiner, illustrates a third embodiment of Hamada’s system, where a non-volatile memory for storing messages and message identifiers is provided for both a current system and a stand-by system (2:66-3:11). FIG. 21 shows message identifiers and message content stored in a transmitting message table 101-5 and a receiving message table 201-5, each of which is stored in non-volatile memory (FIG. 21; 17:25-28). However, Hamada does not disclose removing delivered messages from volatile memory. Thus, Hamada does not disclose, teach, or suggest “removing delivered messages from the non-persistent storage.”

Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Chandrasekaran and Hamada, both alone and in combination. Independent claims 13, 16, and 24 also recite similar features and are also patentable over Chandrasekaran and Hamada, alone and in combination, for at least the foregoing reasons. Additionally, for the record, Applicants traverse the Examiner’s assertions regarding the disclosure of Hamada and the motivation to combine Chandrasekaran and Hamada.

Claims 4-6, 13-15, 18-19, and 26-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chandrasekaran in view of Hamada further in view of Stein. Applicants respectfully traverse.

The claims not specifically mentioned above, including claims 4-6, 13-15, 18-19, and 26-27, depend from their respective base claims, which were shown to be patentable over Chandrasekaran in view of Hamada or Chandrasekaran in view of Hamada further in view of

Stein. In addition, these claims recite other features not included in their respective base claims. Thus, these claims are patentable over Chandrasekaran in view of Hamada or Chandrasekaran in view of Hamada further in view of Stein, for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the elements that they individually recite.

For the record, Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertions concerning the disclosure of Stein. Applicants also traverse the Examiner's assertions concerning the motivation to combine Chandrasekaran, Hamada, and Stein.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are now allowable over the cited art of record and request that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,  
WILLIAM CULLEN, ET AL.

Dated: August 18, 2006

By: /Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale/  
Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale, Reg. No. 55,687  
Attorney for Applicants  
Fenwick & West LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Tel.: (650) 335-7187  
Fax.: (650) 938-5200